

<p align="center"><b>COUNTRY</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Netherlands</b></p>
<p><b>How many OP's are there in your Member State? Do they have very different provisions in terms of partnership?</b></p>	<p>1 national OP (HRM), 5 actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o A. Additional facilities for re-integration of (partly) disabled, mother returnees and elderly (55+) unemployed. Applicants are municipalities, public employment services (CWI) and the national executive body for employee insurances (UWV)</li> <li>o B. (re)integration of (ex) offenders. Applicant is the Ministry of Justice</li> <li>o C. Integration of young disabled into the labor market. Applicants are vocational schools for disabled</li> <li>o D. (Vocational) education and training of employees. Applicants are the sector funds of social partners</li> <li>o E. Implementation of social innovation in labour. Applicants are employers</li> </ul>
<p><b>Does partnership have a geographical focus in your Member State's OP(s)? If so, national, regional, sub-regional e.g. county, district, group of municipalities, municipality, etc.?</b></p>	<p>National:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Operational Programme was drafted in consultation with the relevant partners in the area of labour market and social policy: six ministries, the provinces, the municipalities, social partners, vocational schools.</li> <li>- The four most important national trade unions and employer's organizations, the National Organization for municipalities, the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, the Ministry of Home Affairs and the national council for practically oriented education of disabled pupils, are member of the ESF Monitoring Committee.</li> <li>- For the implementation of the actions, user consultation groups have been set up.</li> </ul> <p>Regional/local:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Action A: municipalities or partnerships between municipalities and the national employment centres (CWI) or partnerships between municipalities and the national executive body for employee insurances (UWV) are the project promoters in the grant scheme for additional financing of re-integration into the labour market of underprivileged job-seekers. These three partners decide together which candidates are eligible for extra provisions.</li> </ul> <p>Sectoral:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Action D: sector funds managed by employers organisations and trade unions in partnership, can apply for co-funding in order to upgrade low-skilled employees.</li> </ul> <p>Between employer and employees:</p> <p>Action E: One ore more employers can apply for grants for the implementation social innovation in their organisation. The project must have the support of the</p>

	employees.
<b>Is partnership linked to specific thematic issues / objectives (incl. possible targeting of specific groups / links with policy) in the OP(s)?</b>	Yes, see the foregoing description
<b>Please specify further what is understood as “partnership” in the OP(s) in your Member State?</b> <i>(See Note 1)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Implementation of activities on the ground (e.g. through projects) and high level strategic decision making (e.g. in monitoring committee etc.)</li> <li>o task oriented partnerships and institutionalised partnerships</li> </ul> <p>Action A. The partnerships between municipalities, CWI and UWV also exist outside the ESF and are fairly institutionalized. The laws on social security, social benefit and public employment services stipulate close cooperation between the three; one stop shops are being implemented and recently CWI and UWV are being merged into one organization.</p> <p>Action D. The sector funds run by the social partners were set up long before ESF, and their regular task is funding and implementation of (vocational) education and training of employees. In the Netherlands education of employees is mainly seen as the responsibility of the social partners themselves. The government provides incentives in the tax system, ESF co-funding etc.</p> <p>Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o importance of ESF funding for partnership: relatively small to medium influence because the partnerships are highly institutionalised</li> <li>o highly formalised for action A. (municipalities and partners have to submit joint application) and action D. (Applicant must be a formally accepted sector fund run by both social partners in the sector)</li> <li>o Written declaration that the employees support the project for action E.</li> </ul>
<b>What requirements are there for partnerships to become formally established in your OP's?</b> <i>(e.g. they need to: write a declaration with intent to work together, prepare a more detailed partnership agreement detailing tasks/roles, launch a call for tenders to acquire partners through contracts or join up in a separate legal entity)</i>	See the foregoing description
<b>What specific questions regarding partnership are asked in (previous/current) ESF application forms?</b>	Partnership requirements are very clear
<b>Types of organisations typically</b>	See the foregoing description

<p><b>involved in partnership (e.g. social partners, NGOs, companies, academia, etc.) in the OP(s)</b></p>	
<p><b>If partnerships are embedded within existing national, regional or local structures, how are these different levels linked to each other and how does this facilitate mainstreaming in the OP(s?)</b>  (See Note 2)</p>	<p>Mainstreaming is mainly relevant for action E. Social innovation in labour. The applicant has to submit a description of the transferability and planned actions for transfer of the results to other employers</p>
<p><b>How do the choices of the OP's in terms of partnership address the EC regulation?</b>  (See Note 3)</p>	<p>The requirements have been met</p>
<p><b>Are there major differences with how partnership was organised in the past OP(s)? Why was the choice made to change? Did EQUAL have influence on this choice and, if yes, how?</b></p>	<p>There are differences: in the current OP applicants in most of the actions are mainstream organizations and the partnerships are highly institutionalized. The action E which stresses on innovation resembles more the Equal approach, with this difference that projects are initiated by employers instead of <i>for</i> employers, as was often the case in Equal projects. A national institute for social innovation in labour (NCSI) that is funded with national means is responsible for promotion and mainstreaming. This institute works in partnership with social partners, universities and a number of major enterprises.</p>
<p><b>What are the strong points of the way the OP(s) organise(s) partnership?</b></p>	<p>At project level: institutionalized partnerships, project promoters are mainstream organizations</p>
<p><b>What are the draw-backs of the way the OP(s) organise(s) partnership?</b></p>	<p>In the Netherlands context with a long history of institutionalized partnerships, it seems the best solution</p>
<p><b>What measures, if any, are being taken to build on the strong points and reduce the draw-backs in the OP(s)?</b></p>	
<p><b>Contact name</b></p>	<p>Brenda Gietema</p>
<p><b>Contact address</b></p>	<p>SZW Agency Postbus 93249 2509 AE Den Haag Netherlands</p>

<b>Contact email, phone, fax</b>	<a href="mailto:bgietema@minszw.nl">bgietema@minszw.nl</a>